

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/727,114	12/03/2003	Alexander Winker	82057	4410	
7590 09/21/2004			EXAM	INER	
KRIEGSMAN & KRIEGSMAN			SAETHER, FLEMMING .		
665 Franklin Street Framingham, MA 01702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
.			3677		
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)	701			
4		10/727,11	4	WINKER, ALEXAND	ER			
Office Acti	ion Summary	Examiner	,	Art Unit				
		Flemming	Saether	3677				
The MAILING D Period for Reply	ATE of this communicat	ion appears on the	cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	9SS			
THE MAILING DATE (- Extensions of time may be an after SIX (6) MONTHS from (- If the period for reply specifie (- If NO period for reply is specifie (- Failure to reply within the set	CUTORY PERIOD FOR DF THIS COMMUNICA' vailable under the provisions of 37 he mailing date of this communicad above is less than thirty (30) day lifted above, the maximum statutor or extended period for reply will, lice later than three months after that. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 'CFR 1.136(a). In no everation. ys, a reply within the statu y period will apply and will by statute, cause the appl	nt, however, may a reply be tin tory minimum of thirty (30) day I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status	•							
1) Responsive to c	ommunication(s) filed o	n .						
2a) ☐ This action is FI		☐ This action is n	on-final.					
closed in accord	lance with the practice u	ınder <i>Ex parte</i> Qu	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims								
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is. 7) ☐ Claim(s)		vithdrawn from cor		·				
Application Papers								
9) The specification	is objected to by the E	xaminer.						
10) The drawing(s) f	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	request that any objection							
·	wing sheet(s) including the aration is objected to by							
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119							
a)⊠ All b)□ Son 1.⊠ Certified of 2.□ Certified of 3.□ Copies of application	t is made of a claim for the * c) None of: copies of the priority doc copies of the priority doc the certified copies of the from the International detailed Office action for	cuments have bee cuments have bee he priority docume Bureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applicat ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National St	age			
Attachment(s)			_					
Notice of References Cite Notice of Draftsperson's F Information Disclosure Staper No(s)/Mail Date	Patent Drawing Review (PTO- atement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6 6) Other:	ate	52)			

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: since the specification is a translation for a foreign language it should be reviewed and revised to ensure it conforms to current U.S. practice which should include headings to the various sections.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example: In claims 1 and 14, "to be precise" is indefinite. In at least claims, 4, 8 and 12 there is no antecedent basis for "the edge". In at least claims 6, 7 and 13, there is no antecedent basis for "the step". In at least claim 8, there is no antecedent basis for "the step". In at least claim 10, there is no antecedent basis for "the surfaces". Claim 11 is indefinite because the sealing means is only between the locking means and cap. In at least claim 12, there is no antecedent basis for "the free region". In at least claim 13, there is no antecedent basis for "the sealing means". Lastly, in at least claim 15,

Art Unit: 3677

there is no antecedent basis for "said flange", "the radial inwardly-oriented free region" and "the edge".

The claims were examined as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson (US 6,592,314). Wilson discloses a wheel nut comprising a nut body with a radial collar (12); a thrust washer (21) and a cap (40 [mislabeled 30 in Fig. 1]). There is a locking means formed as an inwardly bent free region (44) of a flange (43) connecting the cap, washer and body such that the body rotates relative to the washer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/727,114

Art Unit: 3677

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bydalek (US 6,435,791). Wilson does not disclose the locking means formed on the washer. Bydalek discloses a wheel nut wherein a locking means (32) is formed on an edge of a washer (16) and further shows a step (26) running around a nut body. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the locking means of Wilson on the washer and include a step as disclosed in Bydalek because Bydalek teaches the it to be equivalent to the current arrangement in Wilson (note Fig. 11).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Underwood (US 4,717,299). Wilson does not disclose a central recess. Underwood discloses a wheel nut wherein, as seen in Fig. 3, there is a central recess between a surface of a washer (13) and a surface of a nut body (6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a central recess in Wilson as disclosed in Underwood in order to reduce friction between the nut body and washer to facilitate relative rotation.

Claims 11, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shaw (US 4,295,766). Shaw teaches to provide a sealing ring (24) between a free edge of (11) of

Art Unit: 3677

a washer (1) and a flange (17) of a cap (3). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a sealing ring between the cap and washer of Wilson as disclosed in Shaw in order to prevent moisture from entering within the cap and corroding the nut body and stud.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Flemming Saether whose telephone number is 703-308-0182. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3677

Flemming Saether Primary Examiner Art Unit 3677